

May 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11463

their right to be treated fairly under the law. Further, as I have already pointed out, in several States the electorate that would in fact approve any apportionment system in the next few years will be an electorate which is already in imbalance because of existing or past racial discrimination in registering and voting.

These are some of the specific problems which are clearly discernible in the proposed amendments. But in conclusion, I would like to point out that the question goes far beyond mere technical underrepresentation of this one segment of the population. The question is whether or not the States will have political systems capable of action to meet the most urgent problems of our society, of which the most pressing and most difficult is that of low-income Negroes and other nonwhites living in the blighted and congested parts of the urban centers. However the language of these proposed amendments is changed, they plainly contemplate the possibility of a malapportioned house in every State legislature which will at the very least have veto power over welfare, economic, educational, and civil rights measures aimed at remedying urban problems, and particularly the condition of the urban Negro. And if our experience in past years means anything, it is unrealistic to expect responsiveness to these needs by a legislative body whose members owe little or no political allegiance to the people in need of help.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my good friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, knows of the respect in which I hold him. I do not want now to encumber the RECORD with a long colloquy on a highly controversial issue which the Senate and House of Representatives will face later.

I simply say to the Senator that, in our society, we must place our trust in the people. It is the people at the ballot box who must, in the final analysis, make many of the very basic policy decisions which confront them.

It has seemed to me, therefore, that if a constitutional amendment were to place the right in the people to make a decision at the ballot box with reference to the manner in which they would desire to apportion their legislative branch, the ends of our type of society would be very well met, and the people themselves would be making the choice.

People make mistakes on occasion, but not very often. Therefore, it has seemed to me, I say to my friend, that giving the people in each State a continuing right on election day to make their decision with respect to the re-apportionment problem is in the very essence responsive to the type of society which our Founding Fathers envisioned.

I make this comment obviously in no spirit of rancor, but because I do want to point out that when we debate as he sees the light, my able friend—who has devoted himself to principle · record here—I and others will have an opportunity to debate at close range whether Congress should recommend a constitutional amendment to the people and have the people in each State make that decision.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from

California. He has hit upon the crux of this debate. Last year, it was the analogy of State government with the Federal Government and the Senate; the so-called Federal analogy. This time it will be whether the people should decide the matter in a referendum.

The position of the Senator from Wisconsin is very simple on this matter. The fact is that the Senator from California and I have responsibility as Senators. It seems to me that we must pass on the merits of legislation and whether it should be submitted in a referendum to the people or not. We could have a referendum which would enable the people to pass a national lottery, to legalize gambling, or legalize selling of harmful drugs. We could say leave it to the people, pass the buck, let the people decide these and all issues. Why not? Can we walk off and forget our duty? Do we have no responsibility once we submit an issue to the people? Do we approve or anything?

I believe that the Senator from California knows that even if the people can act, we are given the responsibility under the Constitution to express our own position on the merits of these matters. And we cannot get off the hook by simply saying let the people decide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when a Senator must decide how to vote on a matter which runs so completely counter to a principle in which he deeply believes—the principle that every man should have an equal vote—then he certainly has a right to stand on the floor of the Senate and fight as hard as he can for his beliefs, whether or not the issue is also to be put before the people in a referendum.

I also remind the Senator from California, and I am sure that the Senator from California knows, perhaps in the history of California, that a referendum can be worded in such a way and promoted in such a way in the newspapers, on the television, on the radio through the use of an enormous amount of money, that people can be deceived.

I have great faith in the people. I would not be a U.S. Senator today if I did not have. We must realize that on a matter as complicated as this, and as removed from their immediate interest—since it is not a matter of taxation or war—people can be deceived. It is a duty, a fundamental, inescapable duty for Members of Congress to vote on the merits of the matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the latter part of my friend's comment, I completely agree. I must say, alas, that the techniques of deception and deceit are constantly available to those in our society who would try to mislead, whether the problem be an issue on the ballot in a State or in a presidential campaign, or, indeed, in a senatorial campaign.

I speak now as a Californian. The

record of the people of my State in passing judgment on multitudes of issues deemed by them to be serious is an excellent record. While occasionally deception has done its work effectively and successfully, the people in the long run have been able to rectify the errors which may have crept into their votes in prior elections.

This is a very crucial issue. I would not equate it with many of the other problems which we have before us, all of which are important. This is a fundamental question concerning the form of government in the several States.

I look forward—as I am sure will be the case when the issue is pending—to spending time on open and constructive debate with my friend in order, in the public interest, to attempt to find out specifically the arguments in favor of the proposal, as well as the arguments that are not in favor of the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from California is one of the most reasonable as well as one of the ablest Members of the Senate. With respect to these basic matters—and this is a basic, fundamental, and most important principle—I would never vote to deny people the right of religious freedom, the right of freedom of speech, the right of assembly or to abridge other basic rights on the ground that I would leave the decision to a referendum in all of the 50 States. And I would be basically reluctant to vote for a denial of the right to equal representation of each man—black or white, rich or poor, literate or illiterate—in his own State legislature.

DR

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROMPT ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SAVED LIVES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has been criticized on our intervention in Santo Domingo, and there has been a great deal of confusion about it. One of the clearest reports on the instant situation which preceded the President's action was written by Virginia Prewett in the Washington Daily News. I read from that article briefly:

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic country team in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

This is a fine and concise report on the incidents leading up to the President's decision on Santo Domingo which I think should be called to the attention of the Congress and the American people, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

11464

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 27, 1965

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**L.B.J.'S PROMPT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACTION
SAVED AMERICAN LIVES**

(Note.—This is the last of three articles in which Virginia Prewett, prize-winning Washington Daily News columnist on Latin America, gives a behind-the-scenes report on how President Johnson decided to send U.S. forces into the Dominican Republic. Miss Prewett received information from a high source, who cannot be identified.)

(By Virginia Prewett)

When President Johnson between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. on April 28 quickly telephoned or called in the Nation's top officials about landing marines in the Dominican Republic, a conversation was being held between our Embassy there and the Washington message center.

News was relayed to the President that the Embassies of El Salvador, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador had been fired on. The U.S. aid mission had been raided. The evacuation zone around the Embajador Hotel had been broken into again.

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic "country team" in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

THAT CUTS IT

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

He took the position that if he did not act, he risked immediate blood guilt for the Americans. The vision of another Cuba was strong in his mind.

He said later of the moment: "We know there are evil forces everywhere—in this country and everywhere else. But here in the United States they're not in control. At that moment, in Santo Domingo, they were in control."

Mr. Johnson ordered multiple messages to go into effect at 6:30 p.m. The marines were to land. The first pathfinder group did land in LCT's at Haina seaport not long afterward. By 7:50 p.m., 405 marines were ashore.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

With the military order, Mr. Johnson stressed his urgent hope for a cease-fire and a settlement of Dominican differences.

He also called for congressional leaders to meet with him at 7:15 p.m.

When he issued the landing order, he directed the area officers of the State Department's American Republics Division to notify all Latin American ambassadors that many Latin American embassies and diplomats in the Dominican Republic had called on the United States for help, that the U.S. Marines were landing to save American and other lives, and that the United States urgently requested an OAS meeting the next day.

REDS SPOTTED

The congressional leaders stayed with the President until 9 p.m. When they asked about Communist influence, Mr. Johnson told them that the Communist apparatus had been spotted emerging.

At first two known members of the Communist apparatus were spotted seizing strategic command of groups or objectives, then nine were spotted, and more and more. During the day the pro-Castro talisman cry of "Paredon" (to the wall) had multiplied as mobs sacked, looted, and killed.

After 6:30 p.m., nine State Department area chiefs for Latin America were called to their offices. Their instructions were to tele-

phone the President's message to every Latin American Ambassador. This the nine diplomats did. Not only OAS members, but also Jamaicans and Trinidad were called.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, has critically compared President Johnson's procedure with the Latin Americans with that of his late brother during the Cuban missile crisis.

WHEN J.F.K. SPOKE

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation at 6:30 p.m., announcing his intention to order a naval quarantine around Cuba. That night he had the Latin American Ambassadors notified and, like Mr. Johnson, called an OAS meeting for the next day. After the meeting officially approved his action, he ordered U.S. Navy units, already in position, to impose the quarantine.

President Kennedy could do this because the United States had the initiative in this crisis. This permitted him to control the timing.

President Johnson, in contrast, was at the mercy of timing imposed by the wild mobs in Santo Domingo. If he had announced he meant to send in marines the next day, it virtually would have invited a mob attack on the Embajador Hotel—and the emergence of a regime of some kind controlled by Communists.

REASONS DISCUSSED

On Thursday, April 29, at 10:30 a.m., the OAS met and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reviewed the landing and the reasons for it. The CAS asked the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo to arrange a ceasefire. Late that night the OAS called an emergency foreign ministers' meeting and approved establishment of an international safe haven in the Dominican Republic.

On April 30, the special meeting sent Secretary General Jose Mora to Santo Domingo. The next day the OAS named a special five-man peacemaking team and sent it to Santo Domingo on a U.S. military plane.

Acting at its swiftest, the OAS thus managed to get its peace team in 4 days after the crisis peak when a thousand Americans were in danger at the Embajador.

The OAS simply did not have the machinery or the precedents to go in quickly and protect the foreign nationals. The hope is that it will develop the needed muscles out of the Dominican crisis.

CONTRADICTIONS SHOW

A significant feature of the U.S. press criticism of the order to land the Marines is that it comes from the same spokesmen who most vociferously and tenaciously defended the Castro regime. "Anti-war" crusaders condemn the order to land the Marines in one breath and call for Cuba-type revolutions throughout Latin America in the next.

But what President Johnson recalls is that thousands of American lives were in danger. He sees a new and vicious subversion creeping into the Western Hemisphere, the kind we are fighting in Vietnam.

If he had to do over, he would land the Marines again.

Important in the story is the fact that U.S. forces in Santo Domingo have evacuated many more nationals of the other countries than our own countrymen.

MANY MOVED OUT

In all about 2,000 Americans were moved out. And more than 2,500 citizens of 46 other nations.

They include people from Canada, China, Europe, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria—the world. Latin Americans evacuated include Argentines, Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Colombians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Haitians, Panamanians, Nicaraguans, Mexicans, Peruvians, Uruguayans, Venezuelans, and Jamaicans.

These are the people you might ask whether Mr. Johnson should have sent in the Marines.

DESPERATE NEED FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT COUNTERINSURGENCY COMPETENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one matter that I am sure has concerned all Members of Congress has been the success of the Communists in South Vietnam with their subversive tactics. Recently an excellent parley took place at Airlie House in Virginia, attended by university professors, business leaders, officials of the Federal Government, journalists, and others, to discuss our experience with counterinsurgency.

Max Freedman wrote an article on this subject, which was published in last night's Washington Star. I quote from the article:

At present the men working on counterinsurgency are found in marginal positions in various departments and agencies of the Government. They are usually remote from the centers of power, and their advice and assistance often are ignored until the troubles have burst upon us. They lack the power and prestige inside the bureaucracy which come only from an established commitment, a large budget, and a purpose which visibly commands the support of the President.

He goes on to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I quote further from the article:

The important point is that the Communists boast that they have discovered a new kind of warfare in subversion, while we have been haphazard and meager, furtive and underhand, in our response to that challenge. The panel wants this inadequate U.S. policy to be replaced by a visible, vigorous, and enduring commitment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Max Freedman, which seems to me to support the Freedom Academy which many of us have supported or something much like it, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARLEY STUDIES FUTURE U.S. POLICY

(By Max Freedman)

For 3 days the recent conference at Airlie House in Virginia had drawn about 100 people into an examination of the major problems in world affairs. The participants came from universities and from business, from the Federal Government, from journalism, and from other disciplines. Divided in their training and experience, they were united in their determination to confront the problems that will face the United States in the next 10 years in its "Strategy for Peace," the theme of the conference.

This Airlie conference, as distinct from the recent gestures and demonstrations on university campuses, was not concerned with the mere expression of academic anxiety and protest. Its discussions all had a practical purpose—to make scholarship relevant to the actual agenda of the Government and to set

May 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11481

seminars are conducted by experienced referees who speak from practical experience and deal entirely with matters of procedure and administration within the framework of the Bankruptcy Act. This first seminar, followed by a second a month ago, has already begun to promote greater uniformity of administration. The published proceedings have been made available to all referees who have not yet attended these seminars, but it is our hope that in due time we will have an opportunity for the older and more seasoned referees to meet with the newer referees with the end result that better service can be afforded to the public in spite of variations in local laws and conditions.

Much work has been done by the Judicial Conference of the United States in the field of pretrial procedures, in the trial of complicated cases, the trial of multiple cases emanating from a common cause, statistics, court administration, the implementation of the Criminal Justice Act and Rules of Practice and Procedure by Chief Judges Biggs, Murrah, Johnsen, Hastings, and Senior Judge Mari, and their committees. But for most of them it has been a slow and hard grind in order to make progress. Really I believe the time has come when the bench and bar should join with vigor in finding ways and means to keep us current with our work. We do not want to change established principles of decision-making, but it stands to reason that if courts fail to keep pace with the workload, further inroads on the judicial process will be made through administrative procedures that will water down the rights of our citizens to their day in court.

I am pleased to be able to report significant progress on the part of several advisory committees which have been studying and working on revisions of the Federal Rules of Practice and Procedure. Five of the advisory committees have been working over a period of nearly 5 years on this important task and four of them are about to send the products of their labors to the Standing Committee of the Judicial Conference on the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules and the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules have made a thoroughgoing study of the existing civil and criminal rules. Their recommendations were circulated, as were those of the other committees, at least twice to the bar generally and to scholars throughout the country, and the comments received have been given the fullest study and consideration by the committee members.

The Advisory Committee on Admiralty Rules has prepared amendments to the civil rules designed to merge the admiralty procedure into the civil procedure.

A complete set of appellate rules has been prepared by the Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules and these rules are also designed to reach the standing committee when it meets this summer.

It is probable, therefore, that the reports of these four advisory committees will reach the judicial conference and the Supreme Court for consideration later this year.

At the close of the last session of Congress, legislation was enacted authorizing the promulgation of Rules of Practice and Procedure under the Bankruptcy Act. The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules, which has also held several meetings over the past years, now has a new charter for action which will require it to make a new start in some areas of its activities.

Earlier this year, at the request of the judicial conference, I appointed members to an advisory committee to study the possibility of adopting uniform rules of evidence in Federal courts. This committee, under the chairmanship of Albert E. Jenner, Jr., of Chicago, is, like the other advisory com-

mittees, broadly representative of the legal profession across the country. Prof. Edward W. Cleary, of the University of Illinois, will act as reporter for this committee. Their labors are certain to be long and arduous, but they are fortunate in having available to them the results of the studies of the American Law Institute in formulating its Model Code of Evidence and the subsequent work of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. A few States have also made extensive studies in this area, which will be available to the committee.

The bench and bar are deeply indebted to our colleagues on these advisory committees. They have given fully and conscientiously of their time and efforts to the work of the committees. This has involved many hours of controversy and long hours of study of the many comments which have been received from all parts of the country on the proposed revisions of the rules.

On August 20, 1964, the President signed the Criminal Justice Act, a statute which will have profound implications for the administration of justice in this country. There are two major innovations in this statute. First, when defendants are financially unable to employ counsel of their own, the court must appoint counsel for them as early in the proceedings as possible, which means in most cases when the defendant is first brought before the U.S. commissioner. Heretofore, counsel was rarely appointed in Federal criminal proceedings until arraignment in the district courts.

This will be a new burden on the U.S. Commissioner and raises serious questions as to the ability of many commissioners to cope with this added responsibility.

The commissioner system is as old as the Republic. It was established by the first Congress. It has grown and developed differently as the Nation has expanded, so that today the functions and activities of the commissioner lack consistency, as do the qualifications of the commissioner himself. A recent survey showed that of the approximately 1,100 commissioners, only about two-thirds were lawyers.

Proceedings before a commissioner have generally been informal, conducted without a stenographic record, and without counsel being present. The commissioner's only compensation has been through small fees which he has collected. Once the Criminal Justice Act becomes operational, the question arises whether the proceedings before the commissioners will not have to become formal and be adequately reported and, if so, whether our commissioners are qualified and competent, especially the one-third who are not lawyers, to conduct formal hearings.

Undoubtedly, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act will bring to light many inadequacies in our commissioner system. I believe our experience may well demonstrate the need for a thoroughgoing study of the system not only to assure the effective administration of the act at the commissioner level but also to assure that the position of U.S. Commissioner is a meaningful one viewed in the light of current needs.

The second major innovation of the Criminal Justice Act is the provision for at least partial compensation for assigned counsel in criminal cases. It also provides for the appointment and compensation of expert witnesses. The judges of each district have been required by the act to make appropriate plans for the disbursement of public funds for this purpose and the circuit councils are given supervision over the program. This requirement places a difficult administrative burden upon the courts and the successful discharge of this new function will require the active cooperation of the bar. The act must be administered in a manner that will be both fair and adequate to the

defendant as well as equitable to the members of the bar. This act poses a real challenge to our profession because we have had no similar experience. It cannot be the problem of the courts alone. The local bar associations must participate both in the making and administration of the plans. The members of those associations must each accept a measure of responsibility, and it should not be delegated to those in our profession who are willing to accept the partial compensation because they find difficulty in making a living otherwise. To permit this would convert the objective of affording legal assistance to indigents to that of affording assistance to indigent lawyers.

Recently, the President sent to the Congress a challenging message calling upon the Nation for a renewed and increased effort to combat the problem of crime and delinquency. As lawyers, we should accept this challenge as being particularly directed toward us. The judicial branch of the Government is necessarily involved in every aspect of this effort because criminal cases are processed through the courts and because the judiciary is deeply concerned with effectiveness of our correctional system.

In furtherance of the President's message, the Attorney General and I discussed the desirability of reorganizing Federal corrections into an administrative system which would have jurisdiction over the entire Federal correctional process from beginning to end, including the training of all correctional personnel, both those in correctional institutions and those engaged in supervision in the community.

To me, this is a challenging idea and one that seems to offer an opportunity for a vast improvement for dealing with people convicted of crime in Federal courts. A correctional agency thus broadly organized should participate with other agencies in Government, including particularly the National Institute of Mental Health, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and, of course, the U.S. judges through the Judicial Conference of the United States in continuous practical research and development in the correctional field.

More and more, modern legislation has been giving the sentencing judge opportunity to adopt flexible programs to meet the particular needs of the individual before him, programs which combine the facilities and techniques now under separate administrations.

More and more, institutional administrators and probation officers have felt that the ultimate success of their work depends upon their understanding of and coordination with what is done in other phases of the correctional process.

Perhaps most important, we are realizing that the hope for continued progress in corrections rests on the development of programs of research and evaluation which will create and test against alternatives a large number of techniques to be matched with the individual offender.

We are proud of the advances recently made in corrections. The Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Probation System, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Parole Board have been imaginative in their response to the development of knowledge and technique. The steps which they have taken lead logically to the creation of a unified Federal correctional service.

Continuous research and development is the lifeblood of a successful correctional system. This requires continuous experimentation, constant research. It is important in any system which is created that the research and development be separately organized within the correctional system so that its personnel will not be diverted from their research functions and become involved

May 27, 1965

in daily operations. Its work must, of course, be closely integrated with the system.

An important advantage which would result from a unified service would be the strengthening of the professional character of correctional personnel. The new system would break down and eliminate the present administrative barriers and distinctions and it would require intensive basic training.

Proper training programs are a vital part of any correctional system. They would result in making the services of our probation officers of even greater usefulness to our district court judges.

By providing promotion from and to institutional and field positions and by transfers from one part of the country to another, new opportunities would develop for the infusion of knowledge, the gaining of experience and the rewarding of excellence with responsibility equal to ability.

Another function which a unified service can uniquely perform is the administration of new correctional techniques which plainly cut across traditional lines. We have long known that the presentence investigation is invaluable to institutional classification and treatment and to the Parole Board in making its decision. We have also known, and acted on the knowledge, that prerelease planning and counseling are essential to community-based treatment. These simply illustrate the inevitable interdependence of the parts of the process. It is new programs, such as work-release and halfway houses, which bring this interrelationship to the forefront. You can easily see how difficult it would be to place and administer these hybrids in a system which drew lines between the institution and the community.

It goes without saying that the services of all personnel now engaged in one or another part of the Federal correctional field would be needed in the operations of a unified system. The functions they now perform would be continued, and often expanded, but for the first time all functions would be conducted on a coordinated basis and within the concept of a career service.

The renewed interest of the Department of Justice in improving our corrections system has been most gratifying. I hope the judiciary will play its proper role in achieving these necessary and important changes.

We note a tendency today to blame the courts and the rulings of the courts for the vast amount of crime. Thinking persons, and especially lawyers, know that this is not the fact. They know that crime is inseparably connected with factors, such as poverty, degradation, sordid social conditions, the weakening of home ties, low standards of law enforcement, and the lack of education. The courts, law professors and lawyers everywhere have a deep responsibility, however, to see that the rules which guide our criminal trials are fair, adequate and capable of efficient administration. We of the legal profession must consider this as one of our major responsibilities, as must every bar association, national, State or local.

Every lawyer has taken an oath to dedicate himself to the preservation of the rule of law. He must, therefore, realize that it is his responsibility not only to perfect procedures in the law but as a citizen to see that the conditions that give rise to crime, vice and violence are not permitted to exist in his community.

No nation, regardless of its general economic prosperity can continue to prosper unless its citizens in all walks of life are dedicated to law observance, not merely by the other fellow, but by all. In a free society such as ours, this is the only secure foundation upon which we can build our home and business lives. Otherwise, we build upon sand.

There are other things that I could properly discuss with you, but time is precious and you have your own agenda to which I must now leave you, with the knowledge

that your discussions will, as usual, be purposeful. I hope they will also be satisfying to you and contribute to the better administration of justice throughout the land.

LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION LAW IGNORED BY ICC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter which has been of concern to me and to many others. It involves the Interstate Commerce Commission and the operation of the locomotive inspection law. That law, as we know, provides that there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a director of locomotive inspection and two assistant directors. Following the provisions for these appointments, their respective duties are defined and spelled out in this public law.

From information made available to me, it appears that offices of these Presidential appointees have in effect been stripped of their authority and their autonomy, and have been relegated to a status not contemplated or provided for by law. To me, this is not in keeping with either the spirit or the letter of the congressional act, and is not in keeping with the significance Congress placed on railroad-equipment safety, in providing specifically that these should be Presidential appointees, requiring Senate approval.

More than a year ago, in an order dated April 6, 1964, the Interstate Commerce Commission reorganized various bureaus. In so doing, the management and technical direction legislatively assigned to the Director of Locomotive Inspection, his assistant, and the district locomotive inspectors, were transferred to regional managers of the Commission itself and/or the office of the Managing Director of the Commission and the Commission's Bureau of Safety and Service.

Such a transfer of authority and direction is clearly in direct violation of the Locomotive Inspection Act, which was enacted by Congress to assure the greatest possible safety to the shipping and traveling public and to engine-service employees on the Nation's railroads.

The Locomotive Inspection Act provides that there shall be appointed, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of Locomotive Inspection and two Assistant Directors, who shall have general superintendence of the inspectors.

In precise language, the act instructs the Director of Locomotive Inspection as to his duties and responsibilities.

The act also defines the relationship between the Director of Locomotive Inspection and the Interstate Commerce Commission, by providing that the Commission shall, first, furnish the Director with such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as he may require; second, set his salary and the salary of his assistants in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949; third, appoint district inspectors, after civil service examination, questions for which were prepared by the Director; fourth, review appeals from the Director's findings or

orders; and fifth, review rules and regulations drafted by the Director.

It is obvious that the act intends and provides for an autonomous Director, with powers, duties, and responsibilities in keeping with the importance of this area of Federal regulation. But the Commission's reorganization order derails the legislative intent, and wrecks the possibility of economic and efficient administration by the Director of Locomotive Inspection.

What does the Commission have to say for itself, when questioned about the changes? I am advised that the Director of Locomotive Inspection has complained to no avail, and that representatives of the highly responsible and reputable Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, as well as railroad labor generally, also have complained. They are told to go to court if they do not like the new way of doing things.

A court appeal, with its attendant delays and expense, should not be necessary, in a situation in which the executive and legislative intent are clear and unequivocal.

I remind the Interstate Commerce Commission, the oldest of the independent agencies, that it is a creature of Congress; that its members are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; that its budget is subject to scrutiny by this body; and that it is not free to disregard the law. *(DR)*

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTION ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, with American troops now being withdrawn in large numbers from the Dominican Republic, it is well for us to realize and appreciate the good they have done there, and the good services rendered mankind by our President when he decided, on April 28, that the Marines and paratroopers should go to Santo Domingo.

Mob rule was the situation in Santo Domingo. Foreign embassies, including our own, had been fired upon. The lives of many—again including Americans—were in jeopardy, as the cry of "Paredon," or "To the wall," caught on with the mobs.

Mr. President, Virginia Prewett, who writes for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, is an acknowledged authority on Latin America. She is a prize-winning reporter. In a series of articles which concluded yesterday, she has detailed the chaos in the Dominican Republic and the wisdom of President Johnson's decision to intervene. I ask unanimous consent that the concluding article in Virginia Prewett's series, from the Washington Daily News of May 26, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News,
May 26, 1965]
L.B.J.'S PROMPT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACTION
SAVED AMERICAN LIVES
(By Virginia Prewett)

When President Johnson between 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. on April 28 quickly telephoned or called in the Nation's top officials

May 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11483

about landing marines in the Dominican Republic, a conversation was being held between our Embassy there and the Washington message center.

News was relayed to the President that the Embassies of El Salvador, Argentina, Guatemala, and Ecuador had been fired on. The U.S. aid mission had been raided. The evacuation zone around the Embajador Hotel had been broken into again.

At 5:30 p.m., a unanimous request had come from our nine-man diplomatic country team in the Dominican Republic requesting immediate military assistance to save the lives of a thousand Americans in the Embajador Hotel.

THAT CUTS IT

"That cuts it," said President Johnson. "I'm not going to have the American people wake up tomorrow morning and find a hundred of our people dead down there because I didn't do anything."

He took the position that if he did not act, he risked immediate blood guilt for the Americans. The vision of another Cuba was strong in his mind.

He said later of the moment: "We know there are evil forces everywhere—in this country and everywhere else. But here in the United States they're not in control. At that moment, in Santo Domingo, they were in control."

Mr. Johnson ordered multiple messages to go into effect at 6:30 p.m. The marines were to land. The first pathfinder group did land in LCT's at Haina seaport not long afterward. By 7:50 p.m., 405 marines were ashore.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

With the military order, Mr. Johnson stressed his urgent hope for a cease-fire and a settlement of Dominican differences.

He also called for congressional leaders to meet with him at 7:15 p.m.

When he issued the landing order, he directed the area officers of the State Department's American Republics Division to notify all Latin American ambassadors that many Latin American embassies and diplomats in the Dominican Republic had called on the United States for help, that the U.S. Marines were landing to save American and other lives, and that the United States urgently requested an OAS meeting the next day.

REDS SPOTTED

The congressional leaders stayed with the President until 9 p.m. When they asked about Communist influence, Mr. Johnson told them that the Communist apparatus had been spotted emerging.

At first two known members of the Communist apparatus were spotted seizing strategic command of groups or objectives, then nine were spotted, and more and more. During the day the pro-Castro talisman cry of "Pardon" (to the wall) had multiplied as mobs sacked, looted, and killed.

After 6:30 p.m., nine State Department area chiefs for Latin America were called to their offices. Their instructions were to telephone the President's message to every Latin American ambassador. This the nine diplomats did. Not only OAS members, but also Jamaica and Trinidad were called.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, has critically compared President Johnson's procedure with the Latin Americans with that of his late brother during the Cuban missile crisis.

WHEN J.F.K. SPOKE

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation at 6:30 p.m. announcing his intention to order a naval quarantine around Cuba. That night he had the Latin

American ambassadors notified and, like Mr. Johnson, called an OAS meeting for the next day. After the meeting officially approved his action, he ordered U.S. Navy units, already in position, to impose the quarantine.

President Kennedy could do this because the United States had the initiative in this crisis. This permitted him to control the timing.

President Johnson, in contrast, was at the mercy of timing imposed by the wild mobs in Santo Domingo. If he had announced he meant to send in marines the next day, it virtually would have invited a mob attack on the Embajador Hotel—and the emergence of a regime of some kind controlled by Communists.

REASONS DISCUSSED

On Thursday, April 29, at 10:30 a.m., the OAS met and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reviewed the landing and the reasons for it. The OAS asked the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo to arrange a cease-fire. Late that night the OAS called an emergency foreign ministers' meeting and approved establishment of an international safe haven in the Dominican Republic.

On April 30, the special meeting sent Secretary General Jose Mora to Santo Domingo. The next day the OAS named a special five-man peacemaking team and sent it to Santo Domingo on a U.S. military plane.

Acting at its swiftest, the OAS thus managed to get its peace team in 4 days after the crisis peak when a thousand Americans were in danger at the Embajador.

The OAS simply did not have the machinery or the precedents to go in quickly and protect the foreign nationals. The hope is that it will develop the needed muscles out of the Dominican crisis.

CONTRADICTIONS SHOW

A significant feature of the U.S. press criticism of the order to land the Marines is that it comes from the same spokesmen who most vociferously and tenaciously defended the Castro regime. "Antiwar" crusaders condemn the order to land the Marines in one breath and call for Cuba-type revolutions throughout Latin America in the next.

But what President Johnson recalls is that thousands of American lives were in danger. He sees a new and vicious subversion creeping into the Western Hemisphere, the kind we are fighting in Vietnam.

If he had it to do over, he would land the Marines again.

Important in the story is the fact that U.S. forces in Santo Domingo have evacuated many more nationals of other countries than our own countrymen.

MANY MOVED OUT

In all about 2,000 Americans were moved out, and more than 2,500 citizens of 45 other nations!

They include people from Canada, China, Europe, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bulgaria—the world. Latin Americans evacuated include Argentines, Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Colombians, Costa Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Haitians, Panamanians, Nicaraguans, Mexicans, Peruvians, Uruguayans, Venezuelans, and Jamaicans.

These are the people you might ask whether Mr. Johnson should have sent in the Marines.

THE BEAUTIFY AMERICA CAMPAIGN—LETTER FROM ARVID D. IDEEN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the campaign to beautify America, to enhance our land for our benefit and for the ben-

efit of those who come after us, can be intensified greatly if American will pitch in. Last week, when volunteers scoured the Potomac River and its banks for litter, we had a good example of the type of citizen effort which can be effective.

The Lions Clubs of Wyoming, too, have joined this effort, with a "let's litter less" program aimed at every citizen of our State and every visitor. Their campaign is a public-relations effort to make people aware of the need to decrease litter. The State is cooperating in a very real way. The State Penitentiary, for instance, is constructing large highway signs to be displayed on major rights-of-way entering Wyoming; and the campaign is intended to be carried, also, into the two great national parks within our borders—Yellowstone and Grand Teton.

Mr. President, I think this is a very commendable effort by the Lions Clubs of Wyoming. To illustrate its scope, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Arvid D. Ideen, chairman of the program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASPER MOUNTAIN LIONS CLUB,
Casper, Wyo., May 25, 1965.

The Honorable GALE McGEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. McGEE: The Lions of Wyoming have started a "let's litter less" program which will be supported by approximately 2,500 Lions representing 60 clubs around the State of Wyoming. This litter program is the result of a proclamation at our State Lions convention in Rawlins in 1964 and I was selected as the chairman for this program.

I have enclosed a sample of the bumper stickers that will be utilized in this program. We also have 500 window display posters and 150 highway signs to be displayed. The penitentiary is making large signs, 18 feet long, to be displayed on the major roads entering the State of Wyoming. We hope to distribute 40,000 book matches in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Park areas through cigarette vending machines. This will bring the litter program to the attention of the citizens of Wyoming and the many tourists which we anticipate this year.

We of the Lions Club feel that the quotation of John F. Kennedy—"I don't think there is anything that could occupy our attention with more distinction than trying to preserve for those to come after us this beautiful country which we have inherited"—is very appropriate in our campaign.

The Governor of the State of Wyoming, Clifford P. Hansen, is going to give a proclamation to the citizens of the State of Wyoming which will be read at the Lions convention in Cody, Wyo., May 27, 28, and 29.

The International Lions president, Claude DeVores, will be the main speaker Thursday evening in Cody. The International Lions Club represents 800,000 people in approximately 126 countries. It is the largest service organization in the world. We, the Lions of Wyoming, feel deeply flattered that the international president has taken time to come to the State of Wyoming, which is one of the smallest Lions districts in Lionism.

If you have any suggestions or contacts that could be made in connection with our "let's litter less" program, I would appreciate your advising me accordingly.

Your very truly,

ARVID D. IDEEN.

11484

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 27, 1965

MELVIN RUDER, NORTH DAKOTA NATIVE SON, WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, another North Dakota native son has achieved fame. He is Melvin Ruder, a native of Manning, N. Dak., and now the editor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont. Mr. Ruder was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for general reporting in giving outstanding local coverage to the disastrous Montana floods of last year.

Mr. Ruder was graduated from Bismarck High School and then went on to the University of North Dakota to earn his bachelor and masters degrees in journalism and sociology.

He is the winner of several National and State awards for editorial excellence and service to his community. I believe he exemplifies the excellent caliber of persons we rear on the North Dakota plains. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from Newsweek magazine of May 17, 1965, and another from the May 1965 issue of the University of North Dakota Alumni Review.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, May 17, 1965]

PRIZE FOR HUNGRY HORSE

Melvin H. Ruder was out in a barn last week, covering a high-school conservation tour sponsored by the Columbia Falls, Mont., Grange, when a neighbor burst upon him exclaiming, "Mel, your wife is calling * * * Mel, you won a prize." Ruder—who is publisher, editor, reporter, photographer, and general factotum of his own little weekly, the Hungry Horse News (circulation: 4,271)—did not wait for the rest. He raced to the nearest phone. "The Pulitzer," he shouted at his wife. "The Pulitzer, did I win it?"

Ruder had indeed won one of journalism's most sought after awards. The 50-year-old Ruder, who founded his paper in 1946 with the aid of a \$1 loan, was awarded the \$1,000 prize for general local reporting for his coverage of a flash flood last June in nearby Flathead Valley. Renting an airplane, and then driving a car along the railroad tracks ("The road was washed out"), Ruder helped warn 400 families. "I lost money on the flood edition," said Ruder. "We just forgot all about advertising."

[From the University of North Dakota Alumni Review, May 1965]

MEL RUDER, 1937 GRAD, WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Melvin H. Ruder, 50-year-old publisher of the Hungry Horse News at Columbia Falls, Mont., has been awarded a Pulitzer Prize for general local reporting in outstanding coverage of a disastrous flood last June.

A native of Manning, N. Dak., Ruder received his bachelor of arts degree in journalism and his master's degree in sociology from the University of North Dakota. He taught journalism at the university for 2 years before editing the Westinghouse Corp. publications.

The Pulitzer Prizes, named for the late Joseph Pulitzer, who founded the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and later bought the New York World, have been awarded annually since 1917 by trustees of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. Winners are chosen by a 14-member advisory board.

Ruder was graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1937 with a B.A. degree, and with an M.A. degree in 1942. He is edi-

tor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News of Columbia Falls, Mont., a 12-time winner of National Editorial Association Awards. Ruder served as editor of the University of North Dakota News Service in 1938-40 and as assistant professor of journalism in 1940-41.

He was president of the Montana State Press Association in 1957-58, and is currently on the executive board. He is also a member of the Columbia Falls School Board. At homecoming last fall, Ruder was one of six outstanding alumni selected for the Sioux Award honor.

CONSERVATION OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an increasing number of national organizations are currently directing their attention to the Potomac River.

Although these groups have long been concerned with the conservation of the Potomac, their interest has now been greatly reinforced by President Johnson's message on national beauty.

In the May issue of the Izaak Walton magazine, the article entitled "Opportunity on the Potomac," presents a clear, concise statement of what is involved in planning for the development of the Potomac River Basin.

As this article points out, the nationwide significance will not be the benefits which will accrue to the Potomac region, but rather the example it will provide for other river basins. A successful plan for the Potomac must be developed and carried out jointly by the Federal, State, and local governments.

Such intergovernmental cooperation is the key to successful river basin planning. I am confident that Secretary Udall recognizes this fact. His recent invitation to the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and the Chairman of the District of Columbia Commissioners is a welcome step toward such cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Opportunity on the Potomac" be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPORTUNITY ON THE POTOMAC

For decades, the Potomac River has flowed under the nose of Congress as a horrible but accurate example of stream conditions all across America; conflicting resource pressures within its watershed are symbolic of those facing every major drainage basin in the United States. Much of the Potomac is terribly polluted—cleanup action has been slow. Real estate speculators would destroy the natural beauty of its banks, and the Corps of Engineers has been trying for years to straitjacket the river with a series of major dams under a plan which conservationists believe is based on narrow and outmoded principles. In many respects, then, the Potomac is little different than other streams—except that its association with Washington has brought continuing national public attention.

Today, it appears that because of this nationwide interest the Potomac will soon become a positive example of what America's rivers ought to be. President Johnson set the guidelines in his message on natural beauty:

"The river rich in history and memory which flows by our Nation's Capital should serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. To meet this

objective I am asking the Secretary of the Interior to review the Potomac Basin development plan now under review by the Chief of Army Engineers, and to work with the affected States and local governments, the District of Columbia, and interested Federal agencies to prepare a program for my consideration.

A program must be devised which will: (a) Clean up the river and keep it clean, so it can be used for boating, swimming, and fishing; (b) protect its natural beauties by the acquisition of scenic easements, zoning, or other measures; (c) provide adequate recreational facilities; and (d) complete the presently authorized George Washington Memorial Parkway on both banks.

I hope action here will stimulate and inspire similar efforts by State and local governments on other urban rivers and waterfronts, such as the Hudson in New York. They are potentially the greatest single source of pleasure for those who live in most of our metropolitan areas.

The Department of the Interior is already hard at work to implement the President's directive. Locally, conservationists believe that for the first time a truly comprehensive plan will be prepared for the Potomac from mountain headwaters to its mouth on Chesapeake Bay. Presumably, consideration will be given for the first time to recreational and other opportunities afforded by the Potomac estuary—a forgotten part of the river under the corps' plan. It is expected that the Potomac will indeed be cleaned up, and that major portions of its wild stretches will be permanently preserved. It is hoped that adequate public access to the river will be planned from mountains to bay, so that the Potomac may become a major recreation resource for a heavily populated region.

But the President's program for the Potomac will be most important for its nationwide significance—not for the benefits which will accrue to the Potomac region. Mr. Johnson's words seem to express a clear hope that State and local governments will assume primary responsibilities for action on the Potomac—that his Potomac River program will not be a Federal program, but rather an outline for coordinated local, State, and Federal efforts under Federal guidance.

The Potomac cannot become a national model for river preservation and beautification if the Federal Government undertakes the major job. It will stand as a model only if States and localities elsewhere are shown by example how they can implement similar programs on other streams—just as it will stand as a model only if the entire river and all its potentials are fully considered.

For too long have the natural values of America's rivers been effectively overlooked or even forgotten by the several States. With rare exception, the only massive river planning in this country has been done by Federal agencies (generally for limited purposes not including preservation of beauty), with the States watching in near apathy if at all.

The President's program for the Potomac provides an outstanding opportunity to change all this. It deserves the assistance and close attention of conservationists everywhere.

NAVAL MUSEUM IN NAVY YARD

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the fact that what happens in and to the city of Washington is of national concern was once again demonstrated when the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] introduced legislation to make a portion of the Washington Navy Yard a naval museum.

The bill, S. 1927, has great merit. It not only calls for a museum, but also for plans to develop recreational facilities

May 27, 1965

A2709

Although REA is 30 years old, it was as far back as 1924 that Franklin Delano Roosevelt first began thinking about the problem of electrifying rural America. In August 1938, in a speech at Barnesville, Ga., President Roosevelt gave this account of the birth of REA:

Fourteen years ago, a Democratic Yankee came to a neighboring county in your State in search of a pool of warm water wherein he might swim his way back to health. There was only one discordant note in that first stay of mine at Warm Springs. When the first-of-the-month bill came in for electric light for my little cottage, I found that the charge was 18 cents a kilowatt-hour—about four times what I pay at Hyde Park, N.Y. That started my long study of public utility charges for electric current and the whole subject of getting electricity into farm homes ***. So it can be said that a little cottage at Warm Springs, Ga., was the birthplace of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Today a suitable plaque and marker at Warm Springs remind visitors that here arose the circumstances which started the search and inspired the efforts to light up rural America and bring the blessings of abundance of electric power to the farm homes of this great country of ours.

At the time President Roosevelt issued his executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration, only 6,956 farms in Georgia had service, 2.8 percent of the farms. The national average then was 10.8 percent of the farms electrified and we in Georgia were only a fourth of the national average. In August 1935, REA approved its first loan to the Peach State, and in June of 1936 the first line was energized.

Today 69,000 miles of line are reaching 368,000 rural consumers as a result of this most significant program, one which has done more to change the lives and living conditions of rural Georgia than anything else. The investment to serve these fellow Georgians totals over \$166 million and it is being handled through interest-bearing loans to 45 borrowers, of which 44 are nonprofit electric cooperatives.

What a contrast. In 1935, only 2.8 percent of our farms had electric service. Today 98.8 percent of the 92,000 farms in the State are served. And of that percent, three-fourths have received service made possible by REA loans.

But this fine record, repeated in most of the States throughout our Nation, would not have been possible but for a most significant milestone sponsored by a Georgia Congressman. I refer, of course, to Stephen Pace. It was his bill in 1944 which made a significant change in the interest rate on REA loans and the payout period. His legislation removed the shackles which prevented REA from moving ahead rapidly to electrify rural America and reach those thinly settled areas to which no one else could ever bring electric service using conventional means and methods.

The goal of area coverage received

concrete support through the provisions of the Pace Act. Farms never before capable of receiving electric service now found this great modern invention capable of application and aid in increasing farm production and making us the greatest food-producing Nation the world has ever seen.

The Pace Act set a uniform, firm interest rate. This made it possible for directors of the hundreds of electric systems to plan their future expansions on a sound basis, without jeopardizing the ability to repay loans on the earlier sections they had built. By extending the payout period the Pace Act provided an extra margin of credit which enabled the REA borrowers to expand and serve more consumers without endangering their ability to meet payments on what had already been borrowed and invested.

Because more money is invested in the electric power business than any other business in this country and because investment capital plays such a large role in developing additional electric service, the wise provisions of the Pace Act made possible one of the most remarkable loan repayment records in the history of finance.

By the first of this year, REA borrowers in Georgia had made a total of \$78,297,355 in payments on their Government loans. These included \$48 million repaid on principal as due, \$6 million of principal repaid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of \$24 million. No borrower was overdue in its payments.

The record is also outstanding in the other 45 States in which REA has made loans. The money invested in rural electric systems is coming back to the U.S. Treasury on schedule and even ahead of the contract payment dates.

From time to time there has been opinion voiced that the interest rate set by the Pace Act is not high enough. Yet we must consider that in my State of Georgia, the REA-financed systems, with three-fourths of all the rural load, are still averaging only 4.3 consumers per mile and annual revenue of \$437 per mile.

In Georgia, as in the other States, for every \$1 invested in our electric lines, the consumers have spent \$5 in wiring their homes and farmsteads and getting appliances with which to use the electricity now available to them. In 1953 the average monthly consumption was 208 kilowatt-hours. By 1963 the average had risen to 450 kilowatt-hours, more than double. And it is continuing to rise and double every 8 to 10 years.

Surveys have shown that the nearly 1,000 REA electric borrowers have created a new rural market for over a billion and a quarter dollars for equipment and appliances. Here is a stimulus to the economy which could not be reached in any other way. Workers in the cities, manufacturers everywhere have greater demand for their products as a result of rural electrification. Yes, REA can be proud of the record it has made.

Laurie W. Tomlinson—An Exemplary Public Servant Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the career Federal employee always earns and deserves high standing in our Government. Particularly in Congress we have learned to respect these men and women who dedicate their lives to their country, and we count on them to help us serve our constituencies in a prompt and fair manner.

One distinguished career employee and officer of the Government retires on May 31, 1965, in Jacksonville, Fla., where he went to work for the Internal Revenue Service as a clerk in 1933.

He is Laurie W. Tomlinson, who graduated from the University of Florida law school, and worked up the ladder from an IRS clerk, to chief field deputy in Florida in 1937, to assistant collector in 1949, and to District Director for Florida in 1952.

Laurie W. Tomlinson is an exemplary public servant. Not only did he perform an outstanding service to the Nation in his 32 years with the IRS—that saw the Florida IRS collections grow from \$7½ million in 1933 to approximately \$2 billion in 1965—but he was also a civic leader of his community. He served many organizations, including the presidency of the Jacksonville Exchange Club and of the Family Consultation Service, and he also served on the board of directors and executive committee of the Community Chest-United Fund.

On May 24, 1965, a large group of Laurie Tomlinson's friends, fellow IRS directors and employees honored him in Jacksonville, Fla. With him were his wife of 30 years—Isabel Tomlinson; his mother, his son, Laurie, Junior, and his daughter, Mrs. Joe J. Stephenson. They all received the blessings of his fellow workers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the following article from the Florida Times-Union, a fitting tribute to this man's great service to our Nation:

AFTER 32 YEARS: IRS BOSS TOMLINSON

RETIRES

(By Dick Crouch, Times-Union staff writer)

Florida's Federal tax boss last night got a retirement farewell from the people who know him best—the employees of the Internal Revenue Service.

Some 500 persons gathered at the Robert Meyer Hotel to say goodby to Laurie W. Tomlinson, Director of IRS' Florida district since 1952. He is retiring May 31.

The occasion brought out the brass from Washington as well as local clerks and secretaries. Tomlinson's successor, F. S. Schmidt, who will be sworn in this morning, also was there.

May 27, 1965

Leading the Washington delegation was Bertrand M. Harding, IRS Deputy Commissioner (the No. 2 job). Heading the regional visitors was W. J. Bookholt, of Atlanta, Commissioner of the southeastern division.

The evening brought out some little-known facts about Tomlinson, who went to work for IRS 32 years ago at \$24 a week and now earns \$24,000 a year.

The son of a physician, he was born in Lake Butler and lived in Starke and Lake Wales as a boy. He earned his allowance working in a drugstore and a nursery.

After he was graduated from the University of Florida Law School, he practiced for 2 years in Lakeland before joining IRS.

That was in 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, which means Tomlinson has served five men of the White House—something few men in Government can boast.

Last night, he received gifts and honors from two employee unions—the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees and the American Federation of Government Employees—and his fellow directors from other IRS districts.

Isabel Tomlinson, his wife of 30 years, was also honored. She recalled her early years as a nursing trainee at Riverside Hospital and how they struggled like everybody else during the great depression.

Mr. and Mrs. Tomlinson's two children also were on hand—Laurie Jr. and Mrs. Joe J. Stephenson. So was his mother.

Although Tomlinson faces retirement (and a week's cruise) with mixed emotions, a poetic employee of his perhaps summed up his feelings best

"No more taxpayers to sue."

through the torment it has experienced in the last 6 years, and the United States would not be faced with a Communist outpost just 90 miles from its shore.

Address by Hon. Carlton R. Sickles at the Graduation Ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

MR. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a speech delivered last night by my Maryland colleague, Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES, at the graduation ceremonies of the University of Maryland's School of Social Work in Baltimore.

In his message, Congressman SICKLES impressed upon these emerging professional social workers the importance of harmonious cooperation between public and volunteer agencies, between professional workers and the subprofessional indigenous poor who must be involved in current antipoverty and social welfare operations.

Representative SICKLES' speech follows:

SOCIAL WORK ON THE MOVE

(By Congressman CARLTON R. SICKLES)

I am delighted to be with you on this important occasion.

I commend you who have recently finished the arduous study required for a master's degree in social work, for not having been done the easy thing and decided at some point along the way that you could just as well pursue your career without full professional education.

In earning your master's degree you have equipped yourself to be a leader in the centuries-old effort to see that all of mankind have an equal chance for happiness and satisfaction.

You have earned the right to have your professional judgment respected—and acted upon. You have shown your willingness to tackle jobs that require responsible and decisive action. You have demonstrated your patriotism—for the social well-being of our Nation depends on the social well-being of her people.

Your master's degree means that you have the knowledge and the professional competence to carry out responsible missions in the congested quarters of the inner city and in the barren hollows of Appalachia. You understand and know what should be done about crowded housing, illiteracy and lack of skills, sickly bodies, and—more damaging than all the rest—bias and bigotry—aimed at people solely because they are poor, or poor and dark skinned.

The opportunities to practice your new profession stretch widely across the professional horizon.

Your skills and judgment and your prestige would be equally welcome in dozens of agencies, schools, hospitals, churches, and institutions throughout Maryland and, indeed the Nation. You are badly needed by hundreds upon hundreds of families, children, and adults who are suffering from social, health, and economic problems in every community in this land.

Wherever you go, I am confident that you will be appreciated because the demands upon your profession are greater than ever before.

The rapid growth of our national population—with the great increases in the proportion of young people and the elderly—is, in itself, a major challenge to the social welfare field. Child welfare and health agencies are bursting at the seams and waiting lists are long. Many of the children who need help most are not receiving it because we do not yet have the staffs and the programs to reach out to them and their parents.

Similarly, facilities and services for senior citizens—despite the widespread interest and activity in this field—have not been able to keep pace with the expanding population of the aged.

In our large cities, problems are further complicated by many other changes. Large numbers of relatively unskilled newcomers came to our cities in response to the need for workers during the two decades following the Second World War.

They have now found, in too many cases, that their job opportunities have disappeared with the impact of automation and the large number of unskilled applicants.

Unskilled workers in all age groups and in all parts of the country are feeling the pressure of technological change. While new opportunities are opening rapidly for the highly skilled worker, the worker with few skills has found his future darkened and his hope dimmed.

Statistically we know that nearly one-fifth of all American families, including one-fourth of all of our children, are living in poverty today. We are confronted by a critical situation whose solution will require the best efforts of all of us.

Our cities are involved in an especially difficult set of problems: the high concentrations of population; the continuing decay of the slums, which get older every year and would be decaying even if nobody lived in them; the serious lack of sufficient recreational and cultural facilities in neighborhoods where they are needed the most; and the urgent shortages of health and medical care that press most tightly on those with low incomes. The list of problems that complicate the lives of the poor could be extended almost indefinitely.

It was considerations such as these that led the President to declare unconditional war on poverty in America; to propose the antipoverty bill—the Economic Opportunity Act—which was enacted last year; and to urge a series of measures relating to education, health, welfare, air and water pollution, and urban development.

It was similar considerations that led 3 years ago to the passage of the 1962 public welfare amendments to the Social Security Act, the most far reaching attempt to improve our public welfare programs since they were initiated 30 years ago. These amendments have made possible a wide range of progressive changes in our public welfare programs. I don't need to remind this group that the potential benefits of this historic legislation are only beginning to be realized. States were given a 5-year period in which to fully establish the greatly expanded social services authorized by the 1962 amendments. It was expected also that it would take this period of time to get into full operation the staff development programs that would train the increased numbers of public welfare employees who would be needed to carry out these social services.

Along with this tremendous surge of activity in public health and welfare programs, voluntary agencies throughout the Nation are asking themselves challenging questions about their own programs: Who needs services? What kinds of services are needed? How can changing programs be formulated

President's Action in Dominican Republic

DR EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

MR. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette, Reno, Nev., on May 6, 1965. The editorial sums up my sentiment on President Johnson's action in the Dominican Republic:

PREVENTING ANOTHER CUBA

President Johnson's prompt dispatch of troops into the Dominican Republic to protect American lives and property has the wide approval of American citizens, most of whom realize that decisive action could prevent that Caribbean country from becoming another Cuba.

The President was aware that his move could bring a storm of protest from some quarters. The Latin American nationalists promptly raised the familiar charge of "Yankee imperialism" and "gunboat diplomacy." Expected, of course, was a similar chorus from the Communist countries and from some European quarters where criticism of the United States is a common theme.

The Communist hand in the Dominican civil war already is apparent, and it is also evident that Fidel Castro's agitators have taken a hand in the uprising.

Had the United States acted with such firmness and dispatch at the start of Fidel Castro's revolution in Cuba, it is possible that that island would not have gone

May 27, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500120001-3
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11557

RUSK DEFENDS UNITED STATES ON STEPS IN OAS

(MR. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and me, read into the RECORD a statement on the "Dominican Crisis and the Inter-American System."

That statement included our view that "the failure to inform the OAS of U.S. intervention before it was underway was an insensitive oversight." We suggested that while OAS agreement before the landing of U.S. forces would not have been practical in view of the shortness of time, the Organization could at least have been told that the landing was going to be undertaken. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and I had personally given the full text of our statement to top State Department officials 24 hours before delivery on the floor.

This morning's New York Times carries a story by John Finney about yesterday's press conference by Secretary Rusk. Finney reports that Rusk said that the administration had begun to call OAS ambassadors to inform them of U.S. intervention immediately after the decision was made. But, Finney reports, when the official transcript of the press conference was released the words "OAS ambassadors" had been changed to read "Latin American ambassadors," many of whom do not represent their governments before the OAS.

The article goes on to describe how the Secretary had claimed that the United States had called meetings of the Inter-American Peace Committee on April 27 and the OAS Council on April 28 to discuss the Dominican situation. While both of these meetings did occur before the landing of U.S. forces, we do not believe that the United States gave any indication at either session that it was about to land troops. Furthermore, as Finney writes, despite what Secretary Rusk has said, neither meeting was called by the United States.

I can only wonder whether the administration's efforts to deny any breach of responsible diplomatic practice in the failure to notify the OAS of U.S. intervention before the fact may not compound the error.

Mr. Finney's story is reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

RUSK DEFENDS UNITED STATES ON STEPS IN ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—HIS REPORT OF CRISIS ACTION IS AT VARIANCE WITH MINUTES

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Secretary of State Rusk, in the face of diplomatic and political criticism, defended the administration today against charges that it had bypassed the Organization of American States in the Dominican crisis.

In making his defense, the Secretary cited chronology of U.S. dealings with the OAS as was at variance with the official record of the inter-American organization. He also

took the unusual step of amending the transcript of his news conference to correct an overstatement about the degree of U.S. cooperation with the Organization.

The administration has come under considerable diplomatic criticism for sending Marines into the Dominican Republic on the evening of April 28 without having consulted or informed the OAS. Domestic political criticism was added today to the diplomatic complaints.

Five Republican Congressmen led by Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, charged in a statement that the administration had severely jeopardized the future of collective security in the Western Hemisphere by its actions in the Dominican crisis.

One of the specific Republican complaints was that the administration, in an "insensitive oversight," had failed to inform the Organization of American States of the U.S. military intervention before it was underway.

WASHINGTON'S REBUTTAL

The administration has maintained that the situation in the Dominican Republic was deteriorating too quickly to permit consultation with the Organization. This point was made today by Mr. Rusk, who said it was "one of those situations where events themselves made it necessary that some action be taken before the formal machinery could be convened and could act upon it on a multilateral basis."

But starting with the President's statement of April 28 announcing the dispatch of the troops, the administration has also sought to give the impression that OAS members were kept fully informed.

Today, for example, Mr. Rusk said that immediately after the White House decision in the evening of April 28 to intervene, the State Department began calling "OAS ambassadors" to inform them of the action.

In the transcript finally issued by the State Department, this was amended to "Latin American Ambassadors," after it was called to the Department's attention that many of the representatives in the Inter-American Organization had complained privately they had not been informed of the administration's action.

While seemingly minor, the distinction between Latin American Ambassadors and Organization of American States representatives has assumed troublesome proportions to the administration. Many of the Latin American countries are represented in the Inter-American Organization by someone other than their Ambassador to the United States. The administration's failure to notify the OAS representatives, apparently through lack of coordination and oversight, explains much of the criticism of the U.S. actions within the Organization.

EFFORTS TO INVOLVE OAS

Asked why the United States had not consulted or informed the Inter-American Organization before sending in troops, Mr. Rusk gave a lengthy reply. On April 27, he noted, "we did call together the Peace Committee of the OAS, for a discussion of the situation in the Dominican Republic." The following day, he said, the United States asked for a meeting of the Organization's Council "for a further discussion."

Later that day, after the Marine landings, the United States asked for an emergency meeting of the Council, which was held April 29. In retrospect, Mr. Rusk said, "it might have looked better" if the United States had insisted upon a meeting the evening of April 28—a point also made privately by many of the Organization's diplomats.

Mr. Rusk's account of the sequence of events was at some variance with official minutes of the Organization of American States. These minutes show that the initiative to involve the Organization in the Dominican situation, both before and after the

marine landings, did not come primarily from the United States.

According to the minutes, for example, the April 27 meeting of the Inter-American Peace Committee was called at the request of the Chairman, Alfredo Vazquez Carrizosa, of Colombia, and was limited largely to a report by the Dominican representative. State Department officials said, however, that the United States had privately urged the Chairman to call the meeting and that some supplementary information had been supplied by the American representatives.

Contrary to the suggestion of Mr. Rusk, the April 28 meeting of the Organization's Council was not called at the request of the United States to discuss the Dominican situation. The meeting had already been scheduled to discuss routine OAS matters, and the discussion of the Dominican situation was limited to a further report by the Dominican representative.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOORE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 28, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Armenian people from Soviet and Turkish domination. On May 28, 1918, the Armenians united their forces in an attempt to maintain a free Armenia. However, they were prevented from achieving this goal by the fortunes of war, the indifference of World War I allied powers, and their statesmen.

The nationwide commemoration of the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenian people 50 years ago was also the subject of House debate recently.

It is important to note the vigorous support which Americans of Armenian extraction have been giving to the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. They have recognized the practical contribution which such a committee would make to exposing Soviet colonialism over Armenia and the neighboring countries under Soviet domination.

I join in saluting the brave Armenian people on this anniversary of their independence and encourage them to maintain their faith and hope in the legitimate restoration of independence and freedom to Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, Armenian-Americans have made tremendous contributions to our national political, economic, educational, and artistic successes. As loyal Americans they have maintained a very proper and steadfast interest in the restoration of freedom to the brave Armenian people still held in bondage. On this anniversary of Armenian independence, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of Armenia and all other peoples who are still deprived of the right of self-determination.

**DESPITE COMPUTERS BOMBERS
PROVE WORTH**

(Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. HALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, time and again over the past several years our Committee on Armed Services has taken exception to Defense Secretary McNamara's overemphasis of missiles in lieu of manned bombers. We have repeatedly pointed out that to have a balanced national defense, capable of dealing effectively with any emergency—a little war, a big war, a brush war, a guerrilla war—whenever and wherever it may arise, it is essential that we have bombers in our arsenal and replacement bombers in production.

Such a program we do not have. This is not the fault of some of our professional military leaders, such as retired Air Force Chief of Staff LeMay, who have called attention to this need and deficiency in our defense planning. Nor is it entirely the fault of the Congress. Secretary McNamara has refused to follow the advice of the military professionals and abide by the wishes of the Congress.

What has been taking place in South Vietnam points up the importance of and need for bombers. In this connection I call attention to the following editorial entitled "Despite Computers Bombers Prove Worth" which appeared in the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., last Monday, May 24:

DESPITE COMPUTERS, BOMBERS PROVE WORTH

An unfortunate and tragic accident in South Vietnam resulted in the loss of American lives and the destruction of 40 U.S. aircraft including 10 B-57 bombers.

Ordinarily the loss of 10 aircraft from the defense arsenal would be a cause for concern, but not a cause for alarm. This is under ordinary circumstances when professional military men and Congress make the defense hardware decisions.

Today, when the computers veto Congress and the military professionals, the loss of 10 types of a particular aircraft is extremely serious.

Congress, following professional military advice, insists the manned bomber is a vital element in a balanced national defense force. It has backed its opinions with appropriations for development of new manned bombers.

The Defense Department refuses to provide the bombers.

The transistors and tubes of the electronic banks in the Defense Department insist instead that missiles are replacing the manned bomber. Their human spokesman is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who arbitrarily follows the robots' commands.

Isn't it strange that the computers always reflect the judgment of the Secretary of Defense?

Despite the computers' statistics, ground-to-ground missiles with the pay-load of a single bomber have not been used to date in the Vietnam conflict.

On the other hand, the bombers have been flying missions almost daily with proved results. At the time of their destruction the B-57's were being readied for service.

Military men know the value of manned bombers with intelligent humans at the controls to exercise judgment. As Lt. Gen. Ira C. Baker, an illustrious name in military aviation and a columnist for Copley News Service, said:

"The final irrevocable answer to bomber effectiveness came in the Pacific (during World War II), when Japan surrendered before any hostile soldier set foot on her soil."

The opinion is unanimous among the men who have studied the problem, including such professionals as Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, retired Air Force Chief of Staff; Gen. Thomas S. Power, retired Strategic Air Command Chief; Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

These are men of experience whose opinion should carry more weight in defense matters than all the computers in the Defense Department. They are aware that defense requirements are more than a consideration of money alone. Overall capability, human factors and the nature of the war also have a bearing.

The computers are not to be blamed. They do not make independent assessments, but collate the figures spoon-fed to them.

The blame for the serious national defense problem caused by the accidental loss of the 10 bombers in South Vietnam rests squarely on the Defense Department. It is urgent that Congress overrule the computers once and for all and assume its constitutional obligation to raise and support arms.

**PRESIDENT NEEDS AND DESERVES
SUPPORT OF ALL AMERICANS**

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, no nation in the history of the world has spent more of its resources in the quest for peace and no nation in the world has suffered indignities and humiliation with more compassion and understanding than has the United States.

We seek not world domination; we seek neither to conquer nor possess our neighbors nor any additional parcel of land on the face of the globe.

Today, in a sense, we are engaged in armed conflict on two sides of the earth: South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. This Nation that seeks world peace, this Nation that gives freely of its substance to raise the living standards of all human beings, this Nation that believes in the inherent rights of the individual man and individual nations, finds itself denounced because it dares to stand up for freedom and for peace.

This is not the world of 100 years ago; it is not even the world of a decade ago. Scientific advances so startling that they would have stunned the imagination only 25 years ago today are accepted matter of fact.

Remember, if you will, the period only 10 years ago when talk of placing a man on the moon and travel throughout the universe would have been considered almost lunacy. Today it is not a question of whether man will go to the moon, only when.

Advances in medicine, in technology, and all phases of science have brought the dawn of a day when we shall wipe out diseases and sickness that strike down millions. We have the technologi-

cal know-how to solve the age-old problem of the world, how to feed people. Scientific application of agricultural principles and mechanization such as are practiced in the United States, would certainly lead to a day when hunger throughout the length and breadth of the globe would be banished.

Yet in spite of these advances, we see man on the brink of another war. Today the decisions are not quite so easy to make. The nuclear power of the nations of the world can literally wipe out all human existence.

It is this type of world in which Lyndon B. Johnson must lead. When we consider the record of service which he has made in the cause of world peace, it is heartrending to see a segment of the population denounce so unreasonably the course of action he has embarked upon in carrying out the commitments we have to world peace; for, my colleagues, this is the only course of action open to us, if we are ever to see a world at peace.

We seek not to dominate South Vietnam nor to subjugate its people. We seek not to impose colonialism upon the Dominican Republic. But, we do seek self-determination for the peoples of the world, and sometimes it becomes necessary for a nation that seeks only peace to use arms to attain that goal.

It was President Theodore Roosevelt who espoused a policy of walking softly but carrying a big stick. It is my considered judgment that Lyndon B. Johnson's philosophy is that of seeking every honorable means for a just and lasting peace but with a willingness to fight to protect freedom and the cause of peace when no other course is open.

As I told the people in my district on my television report last week, I support without reservation the decisions of the President in his actions to preserve world peace.

In making these statements, I am not unmindful of the toll of human life, of the sacrifice made by the more than 400 brave American young men who have given that last full measure of devotion in South Vietnam. I know full well that these sacrifices are understood better by no one than they are by President Johnson.

Each loss of life for a man who has dedicated so much of his life seeking world peace, economic progress, and freedom is a heavy burden to bear.

Sometimes there are those who must die in order that others might live. From Valley Forge to the Argonne, from Iwo Jima to Saigon, the thousands of crosses marking the graves of American servicemen bear mute testimony that others were willing to give their lives that we might live in peace and freedom.

And as much as it hurts, this is the world in which we live in the sixties.

The situation may well worsen before it gets better. I expect that it will.

The plague of communism seeks to infiltrate into every area of the world. Subversion, deceit, lies, barbaric disregard for human life and dignity are the calling card of these men who hold human life so cheaply. Their leaders seek not peace, but power. They follow